International
Comparative
Legal Guides

Practical cross-border insights into derivatives law

Derivatives 2023

Fourth Edition

Contributing Editor:

Jonathan Gilmour
Travers Smith LLP

ICLG.com

Expert Analysis Chapter

1 Trends in the Derivatives Market and How Recent Fintech Developments are Reshaping this Space
Jonathan Gilmour & Tom Purkiss, Travers Smith LLP

Q&A Chapters

7 Australia
Gilbert + Tobin: Louise McCoach, Simon Lynch, Peter Reeves & Peter Bowden

14 Canada
Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP: Charles Newman, Mike Tallim & Richard Ngo

21 Cayman Islands
Maples Group: Tina Meigh & Hailee Robinson

26 Cyprus
Patrikios Pavlou & Associates LLC: Angeliki Epaminonda & Angelos Onisiforou

34 England & Wales
Travers Smith LLP: Jonathan Gilmour & Elinor Samuel

43 France
Jeantet AARPI: Jean-François Adelle

51 Hong Kong
Mayer Brown: Vincent K.P. Sum & Sylvia Leung

60 India
Dave & Girish & Co: Mona Bhide

65 Israel
Arnon, Tadmor-Levy: Shiri Shaham & Shai Margalit

70 Japan
Nagashima Ohno & Tsunematsu: Ichiro Oya, Masayuki Fukuda, Hideaki Suda & Tsutomu Endo

77 Luxembourg
GSK Stockmann: Andreas Heinzman, Valerio Scollo & Julia Kaalikoski

83 Netherlands
Keijzer & Cie: Nicole Batist & Marc Keijzer

91 Nigeria
Udo Udoma & Belo-Osagie: Onyinye Okafor, Chisom Okolie & Oluwatobi Akintayo

98 Portugal
Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados: Maria Soares do Lago, Elmano Sousa Costa, Raquel Maurício & Carolina Nagy Correia

104 Spain
Cuatrecasas: Tania Esteban Logroño & Arnau Pastor Giribet

113 USA
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP: Manuel Frey, Anastasia Peterson & Andrew MacLachlan

Luxembourg

Andreas Heinzmann

Valerio Scollo

Julia Kaalikoski

GSK Stockmann

1 Documentation and Formalities

1.1 Please provide an overview of the documentation (or framework of documentation) on which derivatives transactions are typically entered into in your jurisdiction. Please note whether there are variances in the documentation for certain types of derivatives transactions or counterparties; for example, differences between over-the-counter ("OTC") and exchange-traded derivatives ("ETD") or for particular asset classes.

Derivatives transactions are typically entered into in the form of the 2002 ISDA Master Agreements and the related schedule, credit support documentation and definitions, governed by English or New York law. ETDs are standardised derivatives with transparent characteristics and prices. In order to be admitted to trading on a regulated market, a prospectus needs to be drawn up in accordance with Regulation (EU) No. 2017/1129, as amended. OTC derivatives are individually negotiated and typically executed bilaterally with features tailored to the two counterparties.

1.2 Are there any particular documentary or execution requirements in your jurisdiction? For example, requirements as to notaries, number of signatories, or corporate authorisations.

There are no specific documentary or notarisation requirements under Luxembourg law for derivatives transactions. In principle, according to article 109 of the Luxembourg Commercial Code, any means of evidence (including invoices) are acceptable in respect of agreements between merchants (*commerçants*) and, depending on the specific circumstances, an agreement between parties may be evidenced by their behaviour. However, article 1326 of the Luxembourg Civil Code provides that if the agreement creates an obligation to pay a sum of money or deliver a fungible asset to only one party, the agreement must bear the signature of the obligor (handwritten or electronic) and mention the relevant amount/quantity in full words. In practice, derivatives transactions are typically executed or confirmed in writing. Evidence of corporate authorisations approving the entry into the relevant derivatives arrangement may be requested by the counterparties.

1.3 Which governing law is most often specified in ISDA documentation in your jurisdiction? Will the courts in your jurisdiction give effect to any choice of foreign law in the parties' derivatives documentation? If the parties do not specify a choice of law in their derivatives contracts, what are the main principles in your jurisdiction that will determine the governing law of the contract?

English and New York law are the most often specified choices of law in ISDA documentation.

The provisions of Regulation (EC) No. 593/2008, as amended (the "**Rome I Regulation**") are directly applicable in Luxembourg. According to article 3 of the Rome I Regulation, a contract shall be governed by the law chosen by the parties, unless the application of the provisions of foreign law would be manifestly incompatible with Luxembourg public policy (*ordre public*) provisions as provided by article 3(3) of the Rome I Regulation.

According to article 4 of the Rome I Regulation, where the seller and the obligor do not specify an express choice of law governing the receivables contract, the applicable law will be the law of the country that is (i) most closely connected to the situation, and (ii) typically where the party to effect the characteristic performance of the contract has its residence, except when it results from the circumstances of the case that the contract is manifestly more closely connected with another country, in which case the law of that country shall apply.

2 Credit Support

2.1 What forms of credit support are typically provided for derivatives transactions in your jurisdiction? How is this typically documented? For example, under an ISDA Credit Support Annex or Credit Support Deed.

Guarantees and collateral agreements are typically governed by English, New York or Luxembourg law. In addition to the ISDA Credit Support Annex, standardised Luxembourg law-governed collateral management service agreements with a central counterparty ("**CCP**") have been developed to overcome collateral fragmentation and optimise the allocation of collateral.

2.2 Where transactions are collateralised, would this typically be by way of title transfer, by way of security, or a mixture of both methods?

Depending on the transaction, collateral may be given by title transfer or by security. The law of 5 August 2005 on financial collateral arrangements, as amended (the "**Law on Financial Collateral**") recognises and allows both security transfer and standard security without the transfer of property. On 17 July 2020, a new law on professional guarantees of payment (*garantie professionelle de paiement*) entered into force (the "**Professional Guarantee Law**"). Under the Professional Guarantee Law, it is possible to grant a personal guarantee securing all kinds of obligations determined by the parties, including under derivatives transactions (the "**Professional Guarantee**"). The Professional Guarantee is in addition to the existing instruments of the personal guarantee (*cautionnement*) and autonomous guarantee (*garantie autonome*).

2.3 What types of assets are acceptable in your jurisdiction as credit support for obligations under derivatives documentation?

Typical collateral includes cash, corporate debt securities, corporate equity securities, asset-backed securities and sovereign debt securities. According to Section 2 of Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2016/2251, as amended ("**EMIR RTS**"), only certain collateral listed therein, and at a certain concentration, may be eligible for initial margin and variation margin in relation to non-centrally cleared OTC derivatives transactions.

2.4 Are there specific margining requirements in your jurisdiction to collateralise all or certain classes of derivatives transactions? For example, are there requirements as to the posting of initial margin or variation margin between counterparties?

The margining requirements set out under article 11 of Regulation (EU) No. 648/2012, as amended ("**EMIR**") and EMIR RTS apply in Luxembourg. In particular, parties entering into non-centrally cleared OTC derivatives transactions shall protect themselves against counterparty credit risk by exchanging collateral in the form of initial margin and variation margin. The margining requirements were phased in starting from 2017 with progressively lower thresholds to increase the number of parties providing margins.

2.5 Does your jurisdiction recognise the role of an agent or trustee to enter into relevant agreements or appropriate collateral/enforce security (as applicable)? Does your jurisdiction recognise trusts?

Security governed by the Law on Financial Collateral and the Professional Guarantee Law may be granted in favour of a person acting for the account of the beneficiaries of the collateral, such as a security agent or a trustee.

Pursuant to the law of 27 July 2003 on trusts and fiduciary agreements, as amended, foreign trusts are recognised in Luxembourg to the extent that they are authorised by the law of the jurisdiction in which they are created.

2.6 What are the required formalities to create and/or perfect a valid security over an asset? Are there any regulatory or similar consents required with respect to the enforcement of security?

The formalities required to create a valid security under the Law on Financial Collateral depend on the asset being used as collateral. With respect to cash held in an account, the security is created and perfected as against the debtor and the third parties by the mere execution of the pledge agreement. With respect to book entry securities, depending on the circumstances, the security is perfected either by (i) the conclusion of a pledge agreement if the custodian is the pledgee, (ii) an agreement between the collateral provider, the pledgee and the custodian, or between the collateral provider and the pledgee notified to the custodian, (iii) the book entry registration of such securities to an account of the pledgee, or (iv) the book entry registration of the securities to an account maintained by a custodian in the name of the collateral provider, with the securities being registered as pledged.

There are no regulatory or similar consents required with respect to the enforcement of security.

3 Regulatory Issues

3.1 Please provide an overview of the key derivatives regulation(s) applicable in your jurisdiction and the regulatory authorities with principal oversight.

The key derivatives regulations are EMIR and EMIR RTS. The key regulatory requirements under EMIR and EMIR RTS are (i) mandatory clearing obligations through CCPs for specific OTC derivatives transactions, (ii) reporting obligations to corresponding trade repositories, and (iii) margining requirements as outlined under question 2.5 above. In addition, small non-financial counterparties and small financial counterparties that do not want to be subject to clearing obligations (see question 3.3 below) should calculate their aggregate month-end average position for the previous 12 months.

In addition, Regulation (EU) No. 600/2014, as amended ("**MiFIR**") and Directive 2014/65/EU, as amended ("**MiFID II**") aim at improving investor protection and increasing transparency of trading activity. The key regulatory requirements under MiFIR and MiFID II, applicable also to derivatives transactions, include rules on investor protection, transparency requirements for market participants and certain obligations regarding trading on trading venues.

The regulatory authorities with principal oversight are the European Securities and Markets Authority ("**ESMA**") and the Luxembourg Financial Sector Supervisory Commission (*Commission de Surveillance du Secteur Financier*).

3.2 Are there any regulatory changes anticipated, or incoming, in your jurisdiction that are likely to have an impact on entry into derivatives transactions and/or counterparties to derivatives transactions? If so, what are these key changes and their timeline for implementation?

After the end of the Brexit transition period on 31 December 2020, the UK is now considered a third country for the purposes of, *inter alia*, clearing obligations under EMIR. Given the volume of Euro-denominated transactions cleared through CCPs established in the UK, the EU has extended the temporary equivalence and recognition of CCPs in the UK until 30 June 2025.

However, the aim of the European Commission, as stated in the decision that extended the temporary equivalence, is to give sufficient time for the development of the clearing capacity of EU CCPs and to reduce exposure to UK CCPs.

To make clearing services in the EU more attractive, in December 2022, the European Commission introduced a legislative proposal to amend, among others, EMIR as regards mitigation of excessive exposure to third-country CCPs and improvement of the efficiency of EU clearing markets. Once adopted by the European legislature, the regulation will enter into force after its publication in the official journal.

In addition, the ongoing benchmark reform will continue to have an impact on derivatives transactions and will lead to further changes in the trading and clearing of interest rate derivatives. In February 2023, ESMA published its final report and submitted draft regulatory technical standards on clearing and trading obligations for derivatives in relation to the transition away from EONIA and LIBOR and onto new, risk-free rates.

3.3 Are there any further practical or regulatory requirements for counterparties wishing to enter into derivatives transactions in your jurisdiction? For example, obtaining and/or maintaining certain licences, consents or authorisations (governmental, regulatory, shareholder or otherwise) or the delegating of certain regulatory responsibilities to an entity with broader regulatory permissions.

Regulation (EU) No. 2019/834 amending EMIR slightly reduced the compliance burden for small financial and non-financial counterparties. Small financial counterparties may choose not to clear their OTC derivatives transactions. Small non-financial counterparties are exempted from reporting obligations in case of derivatives transactions with financial counterparties, where only the financial counterparties shall carry out the reporting for both counterparties.

The offering of derivatives contracts may constitute a financial service, and thus require a licence as set out in the law of 5 April 1993 on the financial sector, as amended.

3.4 Does your jurisdiction provide any exemptions from regulatory requirements and/or for special treatment for certain types of counterparties (such as pension funds or public bodies)?

The EMIR framework does not apply to a number of public bodies listed under articles 1.4 and 1.5 of EMIR, such as EU central banks, certain non-EU central banks (e.g., the US, Japan and Switzerland), certain multilateral development banks (including EBRD, EIB and EIF), EFSF and ESM.

Pension funds have been so far exempt from the clearing obligations under EMIR. However, the temporary exemption, extended by the European Commission on two occasions, is expected to finally expire on 18 June 2023.

4 Insolvency / Bankruptcy

4.1 In what circumstances of distress would a default and/or termination right (each as applicable) arise in your jurisdiction?

Termination rights would typically arise upon the occurrence of insolvency proceedings (as defined in the relevant derivatives documentation). However, unless the termination by reasons of insolvency is provided in the relevant contract, the declaration of bankruptcy does not automatically terminate outstanding contracts. A company would be deemed insolvent under Luxembourg law if it meets the two cumulative tests of bankruptcy, namely the cessation of payments (*cessation de paiement*) and the loss of creditworthiness (*ébranlenment de crédit*).

4.2 Are there any automatic stay of creditor action or regulatory intervention regimes in your jurisdiction that may protect the insolvent/bankrupt counterparty or impact the recovery of the close-out amount from an insolvent/bankrupt counterparty? If so, what is the length of such stay of action?

Upon the declaration of bankruptcy and insolvency, a receiver is appointed to realise the assets of the bankruptcy estate and pay creditors. Alternative measures are available for the debtor, such as controlled management (*gestion contrôlée*), suspension of payment (*sursis de paiement*) and composition proceedings (*concordat préventif de la faillite*). Financial institutions and insurance undertakings may become subject only to suspension of payment measures, liquidation procedures and, with respect to banks, the single resolution mechanism set out under Regulation (EU) No. 806/2014. After a bankruptcy declaration, individual actions and enforcement of court decisions are in principle suspended, save for certain creditors (e.g., creditors holding a security governed by the Law on Financial Collateral or a Professional Guarantee governed by the Professional Guarantee Law). The length of the insolvency proceedings depends on the situation of the debtor and the timeframe set by the court.

4.3 In what circumstances (if any) could an insolvency/bankruptcy official render derivatives transactions void or voidable in your jurisdiction?

While declaring bankruptcy, the court may specify a period not exceeding six months before the day of such decision. Certain payments and transactions entered into during such pre-bankruptcy hardening period (e.g., payment of matured debt received by a creditor who knew about the insolvency situation), or 10 days before the beginning of such period (e.g., creation of certain security interests for debt incurred previously, or payment of debts that have not fallen due), may be declared void by the court upon proceedings initiated by the insolvency receiver. Security interests created under the Law on Financial Collateral are not subject to a hardening period.

4.4 Are there clawback provisions specified in the legislation of your jurisdiction that could apply to derivatives transactions? If so, in what circumstances could such clawback provisions apply?

Irrespective of the measures outlined under question 4.3 above, an insolvency receiver may challenge the fraudulent payments and transactions made prior to the bankruptcy, without limitation of time (*actio pauliana*).

4.5 In your jurisdiction, could an insolvency/bankruptcy-related close-out of derivatives transactions be deemed to take effect prior to an insolvency/bankruptcy taking effect?

According to article 19 of the Law on Financial Collateral, termination clauses entered into with a view to set off assets are valid and binding against third parties, including insolvency receivers,

and are effective notwithstanding the opening of insolvency proceedings. The termination of an agreement made by reasons of conservatory measures or insolvency proceedings is deemed to have occurred before such measures or proceedings apply.

4.6 Would a court in your jurisdiction give effect to contractual provisions in a contract (even if such contract is governed by the laws of another country) that have the effect of distributing payments to parties in the order specified in the contract?

There are no general Luxembourg law provisions or regulations on contractual subordination. Based on the principle of contractual freedom set out under article 1108 of the Luxembourg Civil Code, there is consensus in Luxembourg case law and legal literature on the validity and enforceability of clauses providing for contractual subordination and the waterfall of payments against the subordinated party who freely agreed to such clauses, even in the event of insolvency proceedings affecting the Luxembourg party concerned. For these reasons, Luxembourg courts would typically uphold market-standard provisions on contractual subordination and waterfall of payments, whether the contract is governed by Luxembourg law or by the laws of another country.

In addition, the law of 22 March 2004 on securitisation, as amended, explicitly recognises subordination clauses (even if the relevant agreement or the terms and conditions of the notes are not governed by Luxembourg law).

However, in bankruptcy proceedings, Luxembourg law sets certain preferred creditors with priority of payments, such as employees in respect of certain debts owed to them and tax authorities.

5 Close-out Netting

5.1 Has an industry-standard legal opinion been produced in your jurisdiction in respect of the enforceability of close-out netting and/or set-off provisions in derivatives documentation? What are the key legal considerations for parties wishing to net their exposures when closing out derivatives transactions in your jurisdiction?

An industry-standard legal opinion has been produced for Luxembourg with respect to enforceability of close-out netting and set-off provisions. Key legal considerations are: enforceability of the provisions in case of insolvency (see question 4.5 above); calculation and payment of a termination amount; and a single agreement concept.

5.2 Are there any restrictions in your jurisdiction on close-out netting in respect of all derivatives transactions under a single master agreement, including in the event of an early termination of transactions?

There are no specific restrictions under Luxembourg law.

5.3 Is Automatic Early Termination ("AET") typically applied/disapplied in your jurisdiction and/or in respect of entities established in your jurisdiction?

The Law on Financial Collateral does not distinguish between AET and voluntary termination. There are in principle no reasons for AET not to be enforceable or to be required under Luxembourg law.

5.4 Is it possible for the termination currency to be denominated in a currency other than your domestic currency? Can judgment debts be applied in a currency other than your domestic currency?

Luxembourg does not have currency or exchange controls or central bank approval requirements restricting payments in currencies other than domestic currencies. Monetary judgments may be expressed in a foreign currency or its Euro equivalent at the time of judgment or payment. However, in the case of forced execution in Luxembourg, the amount must be converted into Euros.

6 Taxation

6.1 Are derivatives transactions taxed as income or capital in your jurisdiction? Does your answer depend on the asset class?

In Luxembourg, there are no clear tax rules applying to derivatives transactions. In principle and based on the so-called principle of "*accrochement du bilan fiscal au bilan commercial*" contained in article 40 of the Luxembourg Income Tax Law, for valuation purposes, Luxembourg commercial accounts drawn under Luxembourg generally accepted accounting principles ("**GAAP**") should serve as the basis for calculating the taxable profits. As a result, although not binding to the Luxembourg tax administration, which might deviate from it on the substance over form principle, the tax treatment of derivatives transactions depends on their accounting treatment under Luxembourg GAAP. A case-by-case analysis of the derivative, its asset class, payment and profit repatriation mechanism will need to be performed in order to determine in which category of income it should be classified. Such approach has been indirectly confirmed by the Luxembourg tax authorities in Circular L.I.R. No. 168*bis*/1 issued on 25 March 2022 in relation to the interest deduction limitation rules (provided by Council Directive (EU) 2016/1164 of 12 July 2016 ("**ATAD 1**")).

From a Luxembourg GAAP perspective, the accounting treatment of derivatives instruments differs between (i) futures, forwards and options, and (ii) swaps.

From a tax perspective, the Luxembourg doctrine considers that options, futures and forwards relating to equity instruments should, under certain conditions, be qualified as equity instruments. As such, premiums paid upfront and strike prices would qualify either as a part of the acquisition price (for the purchaser) or, if any, a capital gain (for the seller).

Cash flows deriving from the swaps should in principle only be included in the profit and loss account upon their payment or accrual. However, the characteristics of each swap instrument should be analysed on a case-by-case basis for the determination of its accounting and tax treatment. The return from swaps consisting of an exchange of interest payments (so-called "interest rate swaps") would likely qualify as interest income.

6.2 Would part of any payment in respect of derivatives transactions be subject to withholding taxes in your jurisdiction? Does your answer depend on the asset class? If so, what are the typical methods for reducing or limiting exposure to withholding taxes?

Luxembourg applies a 15% withholding tax on dividend payments or profit participating bonds. Reduced withholding tax rates may be available under the relevant double tax treaties, or a withholding tax relief, under the Luxembourg participation exemption.

As to interest payments, in general, no withholding tax applies on arm's length interest payments. Interest paid under certain hybrid instruments or not at arm's length may be subject to the 15% withholding tax if reclassified as (hidden) dividend payments by the Luxembourg tax authorities.

6.3 Are there any relevant taxation exclusions or exceptions for certain classes of derivatives?

There are no relevant taxation exclusions or exceptions.

It should be noted, however, that derivatives transactions and the qualification of income derived from such transactions are discussed in the framework of the implementation of the Anti-Tax Avoidance Directives into Luxembourg law and especially under the Luxembourg interest deduction limitation rule.

7 Bespoke Jurisdictional Matters

7.1 Are there any material considerations that should be considered by market participants wishing to enter into derivatives transactions in your jurisdiction? Please include any cross-border issues that apply when posting or receiving collateral with foreign counterparties (e.g. restrictions on foreign currencies) or restrictions on transferability (e.g. assignment and novation, including notice mechanics, timings, etc.).

The main cross-border issues relate to potential insolvency of foreign counterparties. For example, pursuant to article 7 of Regulation (EU) No. 2015/848, which is applicable in all Member States of the EU other than Denmark, set-off would be permitted in Luxembourg to the extent it would also be permitted in the jurisdiction where the insolvency was opened. It should be noted that security interests created under the Law on Financial Collateral and the Professional Guarantee Law would not in principle be affected by insolvency of the foreign chargor/principal debtor.

In addition, where the jurisdiction clause of the relevant derivatives documents confers jurisdiction on the English courts, market participants should consider the impact of Brexit on the recognition of judgments. After the end of the transition period on 31 December 2020, Regulation (EU) No. 1215/2012 and the convention on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters, signed in Lugano on 30 October 2007 (the "**Lugano Convention**"), no longer bind the UK. Hence, judgments obtained in English courts no longer benefit from recognition under these instruments. The UK's application to reaccede to the Lugano Convention has, for the time being, come to a halt given that the European Commission declined its consent of the reaccession in 2021. Accordingly, currently the only multilateral regime on jurisdiction and judgments between Luxembourg and the UK is the Hague Convention of 30 June 2005 on choice of court agreements (the "**Hague Convention**"), which the UK rejoined on 1 January 2021 as an independent state. Where the Hague Convention applies, a judgment rendered by English courts can be recognised and enforced by the Luxembourg courts, subject to certain qualifications.

Save for as described in question 5.4 above, there are no specific restrictions on delivery or acceptance of foreign currencies.

The perfection of the transfer of receivables by way of assignment requires the notification of the obligor pursuant to article 1690 of the Luxembourg Civil Code. Prior to the notification, and provided the obligor is not aware of the assignment, the obligor will be discharged while making payments to the seller and the sale will not be enforceable against any subsequent purchasers provided that they are acting in good faith.

In case of novation of a collateralised derivatives transaction, article 1278 of the Luxembourg Civil Code requires that the creditor explicitly reserves its security interests under the novated obligation to subsist, or else such security interests would lapse by virtue of the novation.

Even though the risks are remote, due to established market practice, market participants should take measures to ensure that the derivatives transactions do not requalify as gambling, wagering, gaming or insurance contracts.

8 Market Trends

8.1 What has been the most significant change(s), if any, to the way in which derivatives are transacted and/or documented in recent years?

We see a general trend towards the standardisation of documents, in particular those that are English and New York law-governed. In certain cases, clients have asked for more bespoke documentation, and they did not mind also using Luxembourg law-governed documents. Increasing regulatory requirements have also led to an increase in the amount and complexity of the required documents.

8.2 What, if any, ongoing or upcoming legal, commercial or technological developments do you see as having the greatest impact on the market for derivatives transactions in your jurisdiction? For example, developments that might have an impact on commercial terms, the volume of trades and/or the main types of products traded, smart contracts or other technological solutions.

The uncertainties still related to Brexit may have a negative impact on the market for derivatives transactions in the short term, in particular if settlement is moved outside of London.

Digital ledger technologies, such as blockchain, and smart contracts may provide significant efficiencies in post-trade processing of derivatives transactions. However, given the limitations of the current EMIR legal framework, it will take some time before such technologies can be used for OTC derivatives in the EU. In addition, OTC derivatives are expected to play a significant role in broadening market access to digital assets. To bring further clarity to this asset class, ISDA has recently published new standard documentation for the trading of digital asset derivatives, which aims to reduce credit and market risk by establishing clear provisions for execution and settlement.

Andreas Heinzmann is a partner in the banking and capital markets group of GSK Stockmann in Luxembourg and specialises in securities law, capital markets regulation and international banking work. He advises banks, financial institutions and corporates on the issue of debt and equity securities including stock exchange listings, securitisations, repackagings, high-yield bonds, structured products and derivatives, and publishes regularly in these fields of expertise. Andreas is a member of working groups on securitisation organised by bodies of the financial industry in Luxembourg.

GSK Stockmann
44 Avenue John F. Kennedy
L-1855
Luxembourg

Tel: +352 27 18 02 30
Email: andreas.heinzmann@gsk-lux.com
URL: www.gsk-lux.com

Valerio Scollo is a local partner in the banking and capital markets group of GSK Stockmann in Luxembourg and specialises in securities law, capital markets regulation and international banking work. He advises banks, financial institutions and corporates and insurance companies on the issue of debt and equity securities, securitisations, repackagings, high-yield bonds, structured products and derivatives and related regulatory matters. He has been working in the team of Andreas Heinzmann since 2013. He previously worked at law firms in Milan, London and Singapore.

GSK Stockmann
44 Avenue John F. Kennedy
L-1855
Luxembourg

Tel: +352 27 18 02 32
Email: valerio.scollo@gsk-lux.com
URL: www.gsk-lux.com

Julia Kaalikoski is an associate in the banking and capital markets group of GSK Stockmann in Luxembourg and specialises in securities law, capital markets regulation and international banking work. She advises banks, financial institutions and corporates and insurance companies on the issue of debt and equity securities, securitisations, repackagings, high-yield bonds, structured products and derivatives and related regulatory matters.

GSK Stockmann
44 Avenue John F. Kennedy
L-1855
Luxembourg

Tel: +352 27 18 02 361
Email: julia.kaalikoski@gsk-lux.com
URL: www.gsk-lux.com

GSK Stockmann is a leading independent European corporate law firm with over 250 professionals across our offices in Germany, Luxembourg and the UK.
GSK Stockmann is the law firm of choice for Real Estate and Financial Services. In addition, we have deep-rooted expertise in key sectors including Funds, Capital Markets, Public, Mobility, Energy and Healthcare. For international transactions and projects, we work together with selected reputable law firms abroad. Our advice combines an economic focus with entrepreneurial foresight. That is what is behind: Your perspective.
In Luxembourg, GSK Stockmann is the trusted adviser of leading financial institutions, asset managers, private equity houses, insurance companies, corporates and FinTech companies, with both a local and international reach. Our lawyers advise domestic and international clients in relation to Banking & Finance, Capital Markets, Corporate/M&A and Private Equity, Investment Funds, Real Estate, Regulatory & Insurance, as well as Tax.

www.gsk-lux.com

GSK STOCKMANN

ICLG.com

Current titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds
Anti-Money Laundering
Aviation Finance & Leasing
Aviation Law
Business Crime
Cartels & Leniency
Class & Group Actions
Competition Litigation
Construction & Engineering Law
Consumer Protection
Copyright
Corporate Governance
Corporate Immigration
Corporate Investigations
Corporate Tax
Cybersecurity
Data Protection
Derivatives
Designs
Digital Business
Digital Health
Drug & Medical Device Litigation
Employment & Labour Law
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
Environment & Climate Change Law
Environmental, Social & Governance Law
Family Law
Fintech
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes
Franchise
Gambling
Insurance & Reinsurance
International Arbitration
Investor-State Arbitration
Lending & Secured Finance
Litigation & Dispute Resolution
Merger Control
Mergers & Acquisitions
Mining Law
Oil & Gas Regulation
Patents
Pharmaceutical Advertising
Private Client
Private Equity
Product Liability
Project Finance
Public Investment Funds
Public Procurement
Real Estate
Renewable Energy
Restructuring & Insolvency
Sanctions
Securitisation
Shipping Law
Technology Sourcing
Telecoms, Media & Internet
Trade Marks
Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms

The International Comparative Legal Guides are published by: glg global legal group